



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/871,422	05/30/2001	Arun P. Gupta	SUN-P6466	9273
7590	03/23/2005		EXAMINER	
Marc S. Hanish THELEN REID & PRIEST LLP P.O. BOX 640640 San Jose, CA 95164			YUAN, ALMARI ROMERO	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	

DATE MAILED: 03/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/871,422	Applicant(s) GUPTA, ARUN P.	
	Examiner Almari Yuan	Art Unit 2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 November 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed on 11/03/04.
2. Claims 1-14 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 7, 8, and 14 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1, 6-8, and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sonnenfeld (USPN 6,112,049 – filed on 10/1997) in view of Lection et al. (USPN 6,418,446 B1 – filed 03/1999).**

Regarding independent claims 1, 7, 8, and 14, Sonnenfeld discloses:

A method for generating a question document and an answer document from a database of questions, the database of questions and answers contained in an markup language document, wherein the questions and answers are divided into sections (Sonnenfeld on col. 2, lines 10-17; lines 26-31, lines 46-30 and col. 3, lines 46-52: teaches generating tests, quizzes, and questionnaire into HTML by formulating questions and answers into sections; wherein the questions and answers are stored in a database retrieval system), the method comprising:

prompting a user to indicate a number for each of the sections, said number representing how many questions from each of the sections should be chosen; randomly selecting a number

Art Unit: 2176

of nodes from each of the sections (Sonnenfeld on col. 21, lines 32-65; col. 28, lines 12-19, lines 32-36, line 58 - col. 29, line 34: teaches the user can indicate a number of sections to give for the text and if the sections should be given out randomly; furthermore, the user can indicate a number of questions should be given out per section and can determine if the questions should be asked randomly. On col. 6, lines 27-29, col. 9, lines 31-37, and col. 27, lines 26-29 teaches randomly selecting questions or sections).

Further, Sonnenfeld does disclose “database of questions and answers”, on col. 3, lines 46-52 teaches providing a database of building blocks of the test and on col. 2, lines 4-6 teaches building blocks can be grouped in various sequences to create a question and answer response system.

However, Sonnenfeld does not explicitly disclose “creating a first Document Object Model (DOM) tree from the extensible markup language document, said DOM tree containing nodes” and “making and refining a second DOM tree”.

Lecture does disclose “creating a first DOM tree from a XML document, said DOM tree containing nodes” and “making and refining a second DOM tree”, on col. 9, line 52 – col. 10, line 53, see Abstract: teaches a DOM tree is created from an XML document (can be also applied to HTML) to create a another separate DOM tree to restructure the output data, in other words, a second DOM tree is created and refined (restructured) for output. The DOM tree contains nodes which represents the hierarchical representation of the document structure and its contents.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Lecture into Sonnenfeld to provide a way to create a DOM tree and then make another separate DOM tree to restructure the data for output, as taught by

Art Unit: 2176

Lecture, incorporated into the question and answer data in HTML format, as taught by Sonnenfeld, in order to easily and efficiently accommodate format changes of the data without having to modify the code each time the data changes.

Regarding dependent claims 6 and 13, Lecture discloses:

wherein said creating a first DOM tree from the extensible markup language document includes using a parsing tool (Lecture on col. 10, lines 3-53 teaches parsing XML file to create a DOM tree).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Lecture into Sonnenfeld to provide a way to create a DOM tree and then make another separate DOM tree to restructure the data for output, as taught by Lecture, incorporated into the question and answer data in HTML format, as taught by Sonnenfeld, in order to easily and efficiently accommodate format changes of the data without having to modify the code each time the data changes.

5. Claims 2-5 and 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sonnenfeld and Lecture, as applied to claims 1, 7-8, and 14 above, and further in view of Wanderski et al. (USPN 6,519,617 B1 - filed 04/1999).

Regarding dependent claims 2 and 9, Sonnenfeld and Lecture disclose the invention substantially as claimed as described above. However, Sonnenfeld and Lecture do not explicitly disclose “porting a word processing document into extensible markup language format using a predefined Document Type Definition (DTD)”.

Wanderski does disclose “porting a word processing document into XML format using DTD”, on col. 2, lines 2-8 teaches when the user wishes to display a document formatted into XML; the parser uses the DTD file to determine how to process the contents of the XML document. The DTD is also applied with HTML and SGML (see col. 1, line 26 – col. 2, line 3).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Wanderski into Sonnenfeld and Lection to provide a way to process contents within a XML document using the DTD file, as taught by Wanderski, incorporated into the HTML document of Sonnenfeld and Lection, in order display the encoded document containing a valid syntax of elements.

Regarding dependent claims 3 and 10, Wanderski discloses:

wherein the extensible markup language document is in a format defined by a DTD, said DTD splitting the questions and answers into sections, defining the questions as elements and the answers as attributes to said elements (Wanderski on col. 1, lines 51-62 teaches the DTD tells the parser that the elements within the document are valid syntax and defines the sub elements within these elements).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Wanderski into Sonnenfeld and Lection to provide a way to process contents within a XML document using the DTD file, as taught by Wanderski, incorporated into the HTML document of Sonnenfeld and Lection, in order display the encoded document containing a valid syntax of elements.

Regarding dependent claims 4 and 11, Wanderski discloses:

wherein said refining includes applying an style sheet language transformation to said second DOM tree (Wanderski on col. 11, lines 40-43 teaches applying a transformation script for the modified tags in the DOM tree).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Wanderski into Sonnenfeld and Lektion to provide a way to process contents within a XML document based on a DOM tree, as taught by Wanderski, incorporated into the HTML document of Sonnenfeld and Lektion, in order facilitate the transformation of elements within a document for display.

Regarding dependent claims 5 and 12, Wanderski discloses:

wherein said stylesheet language transformation creates the question document in a web presentation language and the answer document in said web presentation language (Wanderski on col. 9, lines 22-28 teaches using transformation scripts to generate a document for presentation to the user).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Wanderski into Sonnenfeld and Lektion to provide a way to process contents within a XML document based on a DOM tree, as taught by Wanderski, incorporated into the HTML document of Sonnenfeld and Lektion, in order facilitate the transformation of elements within a document for display.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 11/03/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Art Unit: 2176

Regarding Applicant's remarks on pages 9-11:

Applicant argues that Sonnenfeld does not teach selecting question randomly to create a document.

Sonnenfeld is an automated testing system allowing design and administration of hierarchical testing scheme (col. 1, lines 56-58). The system provides a database of building blocks of the test (col. 3, lines 46-52) and wherein the building blocks can be grouped in various sequences to create a question and answer response system (on col. 2, lines 4-6).

Further, Sonnenfeld system has the capability in randomly selecting questions to facilitate the creation of the test (see col. 6, lines 27-29, col. 9, lines 31-37, col. 27, lines 26-29).

Applicant argues that Sonnenfeld does not concern with data formats.

Sonnenfeld teaches formatting a test as an HTML document (on col. 11, lines 46-49).

Applicant argues the combination of Sonnenfeld and Lektion.

Sonnenfeld teaches a hierarchical testing scheme comprising of building blocks such as sections to create a question and answer response system (col. 1, line 58, col. 2, lines 1-10). Further, Sonnenfeld teaches each section to be displayed can be defined by HTML and to be collected into a web page (col. 2, lines 50-52).

Lektion teaches the structure of a XML document is defined by the DOM tree; wherein DOM can be applied to both HTML and XML (col. 10, lines 3-34).

Art Unit: 2176

Therefore, it would have been obvious have modified Lektion into Sonnenfeld to provide a DOM tree that defines the structure of a document, as taught by Lektion, incorporated into the HTML document of Sonnenfeld.

Regarding Applicant's remarks on page 12:

Applicant argues that Wanderski fails to teach porting a word processing document in XML format.

Wanderski teaches translating an input document into XML (see Abstract). Further, Wanderski teaches a document can be encoded into XML format (on col. 2, lines 2-8).

Therefore, it would have been obvious have modified Wanderski into Sonnenfeld and Lektion to provide a document encoded in XML format, as taught by Wanderski, incorporated into the HTML document of Sonnenfeld and Lektion.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2176


however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Almari Yuan whose telephone number is 571-272-4104. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays - Fridays (8:30am - 5:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild, can be reached on 571-272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AY
March 20, 2005


SANJIV SHAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER